

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges allowance of claims 26–42.

Claims 1–3, 10 and 13–16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the primary Ewing et al reference. In the rejection of Claims 1 and 2, the Examiner has indicated that the Ewing et al reference discloses a button 37 associated with remote control 40 which will arm and disarm the alarm device. Claim 1 has been further amended to specifically recite that the operator input means further includes means for sounding said alarm means regardless of the state of operation selected via the operator input means and that the circuit means is further operable to sound the alarm means when the further operator input means are selected. This means that regardless of whether the first or second state of operation is selected via the operator input means, further means are associated with the operator input means such that activation of such further operator input means will instantly sound the alarm means. This means that the audible alarm associated with the alarm means as recited in Claim 1 will sound when this further operator input means is selected. This is not true of the Ewing reference wherein activation of the button 37 on the remote control 40 merely transmits a discreet signal from the FM transmitter 38 to the alarm unit receiver 19 which thereafter transmits a signal to relay 23 so as to change the state of relay 23 thereby merely arming the alarm unit 1. No sounding of the alarm unit takes place when button 37 is activated. It merely arms the alarm unit 1. This is clearly explained at column 3, lines 36 – 42 and at column 4, lines 9 – 12 of the Ewing reference. Claim 1 is clearly and patentably distinguishable over the Ewing reference.

Independent claim 10 has likewise been amended to specifically require that the second operator input means sound the audible alarm when said second operator input means are activated regardless of whether the present device is in either its first or second states of operation. Here again, when the second operator input means of Claim 10 is activated, the audible alarm is immediately sounded regardless of the state of operation previously selected. This is clearly not true of the Ewing reference. Here again, Claim 10 is clearly and patentably distinguishable over the Ewing reference.

New Claim 43 is objected Claim 5 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of Claim 1. This claim is now in allowable condition.

New Claim 44 is objected Claim 18 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 10. This claim is now in allowable condition.

It is now believed that all of the pending claims in the present application, namely, claims 1-44 are in allowable condition and contain limitations and restrictions which patentably distinguish them under the cited prior art.

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Application of: Linda Sosna
Serial No.: 10/605,594
Amendment A

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11 APR 05


Samuel Digirolamo

Reg. No. 29,915

Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP

720 Olive Street, Suite 2400

St. Louis, MO 63101

314-345-6000

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT